

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 32 because the word "announcement" should have read --announcement player--.

Claim 32 has been amended to correct the typographical error and the objection is thereby traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-26 and 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Emam et al. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Emam et al. teach a dynamic call processing system and method for providing a dynamic call response system that enables users to easily personalize or customize responses to incoming calls (paragraph [0004]). Emam et al. teach that "Dynamic creation of a response to an incoming call based at least in part upon the validation of the caller's credentials (e.g., name, phone number...) against local information on the users active computing device or cached at a service provider significantly improves customer's experience with voice messaging" (paragraph [0010], line is 5-10). Emam et al. further teach that "called parties or entities can receive notifications upon receipt of a call from a particular person. For example, if an important client, as defined in the preferences, calls and then notification can be provided to the called party via any one of a plurality of devices such as a pager, a phone (e.g., mobile, home, office), a personal digital assistants (PDA), or a computer (e.g., via e-mail, instant message...)" (paragraph [0009], lines 2-9). Emam et al. also teach that "Optionally, the service subscriber can be notified of an incoming call. For example, notification can be based on preferences or rules that specify if, when and from whom notifications will be generated" (paragraph [0055], lines 31-33). "As well, a client could specify that rather than being notified of a receipt of a particularly important [call] that call processing system should forward the call to another phone number (e.g., mobile, home, car, office)" (paragraph [0055], last 5 lines).

As is understood by any person of ordinary skill in the art, Emam et al. therefore teach a dynamic call processing system having completely different objectives and

implemented in a completely different way than the instant invention. The object of Emam et al. is to provide tailored feedback to the calling party (paragraph [0004]).

The object of the instant invention is to provide enhanced inbound call control using one or more messaging interfaces available to the called party (see paragraphs [0012]-[0014] of the instant application). In accordance with the instant invention, and now explicitly recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 26, inbound calls are controlled in accordance with a call treatment option selected by the service subscriber in response to an inbound call notification message. This is neither taught nor suggested by Emam et al.

As explained above, and described by Emam et al. at paragraph [0055], a service subscriber using the system taught by Emam et al. cannot respond to an incoming call notification. At best, the service subscriber can specify [in static rules] that rather than being notified of a receipt of a particularly important call, the call processing system should forward the call to another phone number (paragraph [0055], last 5 lines). Otherwise, all responses sent to the CALLING PARTY are determined based on rules that are dynamic only in the sense that they may be changed on demand by the service subscriber. The rules are stored on service subscriber computer equipment or on service provider computer equipment and referenced by the system taught by Emam et al. when an inbound call is received.

Amended independent claims 1, 17 and 26 therefore clearly distinguish over the teachings of Emam et al. and the rejection of claims 1, 4-26 and 29-38 is traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 2-3 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emam et al. in view of Williams et al. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Williams et. al teach nothing that remedies the above-noted deficiencies of Emam et al.. The rejection of claims 2-3 and 27-28 is thereby traversed.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and claims 12, 16, 18, 21 and 36 have been amended to correct minor informalities and/or to accord with amended independent claims 1, 17 and 26. No new matter has been added.

Appl. No. 10/806,135

Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2007

In view of the amendments made to the above-noted claims, and for reasons set forth above in detail, this application is now considered to be in a condition for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,
L. LLOYD WILLIAMS et al.

By /Kent Daniels/
Registration No.
Agent for Applicant

Date: September 11, 2007

Address: OGILVY RENAULT, LLP/S.N.E.C
45 O'Connor, Suite 1500
Ottawa, ON K1P 1A4
Canada
Telephone: 613-780-8673